

Foundation of The Sikh Faith

J. S. Grewal

Ch. 1 of
'Five Centuries of Sikh Tradition'
Edited by Reeta Grewal & Sheena Pall

2005

Manohar Publishers & Distributors
New Delhi

1

Foundation of the Sikh Faith

J . S . G R E W A L

Tracing what may loosely be regarded as the history of religious dispensations in India, Bhai Gurdas comes close to his own times, the early seventeenth century, and observes that there were four *varnas* among the Hindus and four schools (*mazhabs*) among the Muslims. Engrossed in self-conceit, niggardliness of spirit and pride, they pointlessly pulled in different directions. The Ganges and Benares were sacred to the Hindus and Mecca and Ka'aba to the Muslims. Circumcision was sacrosanct among the Muslims; the sacred thread (*janju*) and the sacred mark (*tilak*) among the Hindus. Giving the name of Ram or Rahim to one God, they ignorantly created two ways. Forgetting the Vedas and the *Quran* (*kateb*) they were led astray by greed and earthly attachment. Locked in a deadly contention, the Brahman and the Mulla missed the truth. They remained subject to the chain of transmigration.¹

As Bhai Gurdas puts it, the fog of ignorance was lifted by Guru Nanak and darkness vanished with the rising of the sun. Truth was proclaimed in all the nine regions of the earth. At last, the Gurmukh was made manifest in the Dark Age (*kaljug*).² Guru Nanak was sent by the Merciful One to save the crying humanity. He showed the path of humility to his Sikhs in the worship of one God; he spread the fully restored *dharma* among all the four *varnas*, making no distinction between the prince and the pauper. True to his mission, Guru Nanak saved the world in the Dark Age by proclaiming the true Name (*satnam*).³ The true Name is the only means of liberation. They who take refuge in the Guru receive the gift of liberation through the true Word (*sat sabad*).⁴

II

Bhai Gurdas gives trenchant expression to the idea that Sikhism arose in a context of religious contention. But how did Guru Nanak look upon Hindus and Muslims of his day? Guru Nanak refers to the dominance of Islam in the Dark Age when God is called Allah and blue dress is current. The dominance of Islam is intimately linked with the establishment of Turko-Afghan rule.⁵ The *shaikhs* are an integral part of this new dispensation. Now that the turn of the *shaikhs* had come, the *ad-purakh* was called Allah; such was now the custom that gods and their temples were taxed.⁶ Babur's troops, the marriage party of sin, indulged in the rape of innocent women and the murder of unarmed men (the subject people).⁷

Guru Nanak had no sympathy with the rulers who lorded over the people and indulged in luxuries – fleet-footed caparisoned horses, colourful *harems*, tall mansions, pleasures of all kinds.⁸ The *Babur-vani* verses should be read in this context and not only as a kind of nemesis:

Where are now the sports, the stables and horses, the trumpets and clarions? Where are now the sword-belts, the carriages and the scarlet tunics? Where are now the mirrors and the handsome faces? They are nowhere to be seen.

Again:

Where are now the mansions, palaces and seraglios? Where are now the soft beds and the beautiful women whose sight banished sleep? Where are the betels and the *harems*? They have all vanished.⁹

The rulers were corrupt. They dispensed justice, not in the name of God (Khuda) but when their palm was greased.¹⁰ The *qazi*, the kingpin of the administration of justice, ate an unlawfully earned food, comparable to dirt.¹¹ Furthermore, the rulers oppressed the subject people. The *rajas* acted like lions and the *muqaddams* like dogs; they fell upon the *raiya* day and night. The officials of the state inflicted wounds to kill the prey and 'the dogs', their servants, ate its liver and licked its blood.¹² It must be noted that, even if *rajas* are taken to be the Afghan rulers, all the *muqaddams* could not be Muslim. Obviously, the Hindu *muqaddams* collaborated with the rulers in their oppression of the common

place of honour with God, the *shaikh* gives this assurance to others as well. His position is compared to that of the rat which is too fat to enter the hole and yet ties a winnowing basket (*chhaj*) to its tail. He does not have trust in God either: he receives revenue-free land from the state (which is unjust).¹⁹

III

Guru Nanak's view of contemporary Hindus is not much different. The Shaktas are summarily condemned (possibly for a ritual that involved drinking of alcohol and indulgence in sexual intercourse) – like the Jain monks who are denounced primarily for their atheism. The *pandit* is a blind follower of tradition, devoid of any serious thinking.²⁰ He himself does not know, but he teaches others; he runs his shop on falsehood.²¹ He is comparable with the spider that weaves its web all the time, living and dying upside down: he talks of the Vedas and the Shastras but pursues worldly occupations; this pretence does not cleanse his inner dirt.²² The sacred thread and the sacred mark are of no avail.²³ They are useless or irrelevant in the eyes of Guru Nanak. On the authority of the Vedas, the Shastras and the Puranas, the *pandit* tries to uphold much that has become irrelevant, useless or harmful – social customs and ceremonies as well as religious beliefs, rites and practices.

The *jogis* are often mentioned with the *pandit* and the *pir*. One cannot get rid of pride (*garb*) by smearing the body with ash.²⁴ Like blind fools, the *jogi* lives in the wilderness or sits in the cremation ground. He begs for food and clothing. He sits in meditation and yet indulges in wrangling every day. He hankers after supernatural powers.²⁵ He does not know what is real *jog*:

Jog does not lie in the cloak, nor in the staff, nor in smearing the body with ash; it does not consist in ear-rings, nor in shaving the hair, nor in blowing the horn; it is attained by living pure amidst the impurities of attachment.²⁶

Guru Nanak castigates the *jogis* for their lack of concern for the people and their assumption that they can attain to the state of *sahaj* with self-effort alone, without the grace of God.

It may come to some scholars as a surprise that Guru Nanak

thinks of the representatives of Vaishnava *bhakti* as no better than the *jogis*.²⁷ But there is nothing surprising in this. In the first place, Vishnu is not God for Guru Nanak. Secondly, Guru Nanak does not subscribe to the idea of incarnation. Therefore, whatever their greatness, Rama and Krishna are human beings in his eyes. Their worship cannot have any merit. The impersonations of Krishna and Rama in dance and song, which were somewhat popular in the time of Guru Nanak, elicit no appreciation from him. In fact, they are noticed for ridicule. In the first place, acting or dancing as a profession has no moral merit.²⁸ Yoked to the service of religion, they become a demerit.

The disciples play on musical instruments and the *gurus* dance; they move their feet and they move their head; dust rises to fall in their hair; people laugh and go home. They dance for bread and fall on the ground, singing of *gopis* and of Kahn, singing of Sita and of Ram.²⁹

From the statement of Bhai Gurdas about the emergence of Sikhism in response to Hindu-Muslim strife we have moved into a much more complex situation in which Guru Nanak appears to approve of neither the Sufis nor the *ulama*, neither the *pandits* nor the *jogis*, and not even of Vaishnava *bhakti*. The only category of people whom Guru Nanak positively appreciates are the *sants*. For example, 'there is no access to the company of *sants* without the Guru'.³⁰ Quite obviously, the company of *sants* is cherishable. However, the '*sants*' of Guru Nanak have to be carefully identified.

IV

W.H. McLeod places Guru Nanak squarely in the *sant tradition* as a synthesis of elements drawn from Vaishnava *bhakti* and the *hatha-yoga* of Nath *jogis*, with a marginal contribution from Sufism. Among the *sants*, McLeod mentions Namdev, Ravidas and Kabir. For him, the pattern evolved by Guru Nanak is 'a reworking of the Sant synthesis'; it does not depart far from the Sant sources 'as far as its fundamental components are concerned'. Guru Nanak uses *sant* categories and *sant* terminology and affirms *sant* doctrines. However, the *sant* synthesis is amplified, clarified and integrated in considerable measure by Guru Nanak, particularly through his concepts of the Shabad, the Nam, the

Guru, and the Hukam. What we find in his works is an 'expanded and re-interpreted' *sant* thought. Within the pattern of *sant* belief Guru Nanak's synthesis possesses 'a significant originality' and 'a unique clarity'. It possesses also the quality of survival.³¹

McLeod has been criticized for his hypothesis about Guru Nanak's relationship with the *sant* tradition. However, he has not discarded his hypothesis, arguing that, whereas for a believer it may be natural to believe that his religion is a revealed religion, it is legitimate for a historian 'to explore the surrounding religious landscape and the society in which a particular religion was born'.³² McLeod underlines the 'unqualified emphasis' of the *sants* on 'the interior nature of spiritual understanding' and 'the discipline' required for *moksha* as 'an eternal equipoise'. The ideas of incarnation, idol-worship, sacred scriptures and pilgrimages are discarded in favour of focus on the Word.³³ The stress is on the irrelevance of caste status as a means of deliverance and on the formless quality of God. The essence of *sant* belief remains loving devotion to a personal deity.³⁴ McLeod examines the teachings of Guru Nanak and comes to the conclusion that: 'In Guru Nanak, as in Kabir, there is the same rejection of exterior forms, the same insistence on the need for inward devotion and its sufficiency as the sole means of liberation.'³⁵

Furthermore, if the question whether or not Guru Nanak was a *sant* is strictly a question of antecedents and influences, 'the answer must be in the affirmative'. This does not mean that there is no originality in the hymns of Guru Nanak. There is much that is 'profoundly original' in them and there is 'an integrated and coherent system no other *sant* has produced; there is a clarity no other Sant has matched'. Add to this the appointment of a successor by Guru Nanak. 'Nothing in the Sant experience can remotely compare to the Panth which was eventually to emerge from that decision of Guru Nanak.'³⁶

McLeod dwells on shared terminology and categories of thought, and tends to think in terms of influences and borrowings, but his approach leaves out the creative response of both Kabir and Guru Nanak to their historical situation. Moreover, McLeod does not take into account what Kabir and Guru Nanak *did*, quite apart from what they *said*. Only the entire range of ideas

and actions can enable us to see the differences as well as the similarities between Kabir and Guru Nanak.

V

It is true that Kabir uses the terms *nam*, *shabad*, *guru* and *hukam* in his compositions but nowhere with the kind of emphasis that we find in the compositions of Guru Nanak. Take for example the concept of *hukam*:

How is Truth to be attained,
How the veil of falsehood torn asunder?
Submit to the *hukam*; walk in its way: Nanak, thus it is written.³⁷

The idea of walking in the way of *hukam* to attain Truth is nowhere to be found in Kabir. Even the concept of *hukam* is not so comprehensive in Kabir as it is in Guru Nanak:

The *hukam* is beyond describing. All forms were created by the *hukam*; life was created through the *hukam*; greatness is imparted in accordance with the *hukam*. Distinctions between what is exalted and what is lowly are the result of the *hukam* and in accordance with it suffering comes to some and joy to others. Through the *hukam* one receives blessing, and another is condemned to everlasting transmigration. All were within the *hukam*; none are beyond its authority. Nanak, if anyone comprehends the *hukam*, his *haumai* is purged.³⁸

As McLeod himself says, the *hukam* is 'an all-embracing principle, the sum total of all divinely instituted laws; and it is a revelation of the nature of God'.³⁹ Indeed, Guru Nanak's use of *hukam* carries his thought most obviously beyond the thought of Kabir.⁴⁰ Incidentally, Guru Nanak's emphasis on divine grace (*nadar*) also carries him beyond Kabir.⁴¹ It may be pointed out that the divine order (*hukam*) and divine grace (*nadar*) are the obverse and the reverse of the same coin: one underlines God's omnipotence and the other his kindness, without compromising his absolute power and absolute freedom.

Similarly, Guru Nanak's emphasis on the Name (*nam*) is greater than Kabir's, and the concept is more comprehensive:

Through the Name, one can cross the ocean of existence. Through the Name one can obtain the secret of true worship and honour. The Name is one's best ornament, intellect and objective. Through the Name one

gets recognition from others; without the Name there can be no honour. All other wisdom is mere pretence; there is no fulfilment without the Name. In the Name is real power, the authority of the *diwan*, the might of the army, and the sovereignty of the *sultan*. Through the Name come true honour and greatness, and the mark of God's merciful grace. The state of eternal bliss is found in the Name, the proper way of adoration. The Name is the nectar that purges the poison (of *maya*). Through the Name descends all happiness upon one's heart.⁴²

Add to this stanza the verse:

Whatever God has made is an expression of the Name. There is no part of creation which is not an expression of God.⁴³

The Name is the total expression of all that God is: the Name is the Truth. Human beings are called upon to meditate on the Name. For Kabir, too, there is no emancipation without *Ram-nam*.⁴⁴ However, we do not get the impression that the Name for Kabir holds strictly the same significance as for Guru Nanak. Indeed, it has been suggested that the Name in Guru Nanak's compositions is the creative and dynamic immanence of God.⁴⁵ McLeod himself says that Guru Nanak's concepts of the *shabad* and the Guru, as much as the concepts of the *hukam* and the *nam*, 'carry us beyond anything that the works of earlier Sants offer in any explicit form'.⁴⁶ Differences of degree tend to result in a difference of kind.

The differences between Kabir and Guru Nanak appear to arise from their conception of God. It is true that God for them is one, both transcendent and immanent. Both reject the idea of incarnation. Nevertheless, whereas Kabir tends to be monistic, Guru Nanak is emphatic about the attributes of a personal God. This Being is one, creator and sustainer of all things, immanent in his creation, without fear and without enmity, not subject to time, beyond birth and death, himself responsible for his own manifestation and known by the Guru's grace. Kabir however does not celebrate the greatness or the grace of God in the same way as Guru Nanak does:

Having heard of your greatness everyone speaks of it, but only by seeing can you know the immensity of your greatness. No one can know or express your worth. They who tell of you are gathered up into you. Great are you, my lord, ineffable and of excellences beyond

comprehending. None can encompass the measure of your greatness. The exegetes gather together and expound the scripture; all extollers of your worth together try to determine that worth; men of understanding and men of contemplation, *gurus* and the *gurus of gurus* (who proclaim your greatness) express not even a fragment of your greatness. All truth, all austerities, all goodness, all the impressive works of *siddhas* (owe their existence to you). Without you none has scaled the mystical heights but when your grace is received, no obstacle remains. Yours is a storehouse filled with excellences beyond telling. He to whom you give support does not need any other help. Nanak declares: you are the true one and all is in your hands.⁴⁷

There is no hymn of this kind in the compositions of Kabir, neither in *Guru Granth Sahib* nor in the *Bijak*.

The monistic tendency of Kabir's thought can be seen in some of his hymns included in the *Bijak*:

Pandit, you have got it wrong. There is no creator or creation there, no gross or fine, no wind or fire, no sun, moon, earth or water, no radiant form, no time there, no word, no flash, no faith, no cause and effect, nor any thought of the Veda. No Hari or Brahma, no Shiva or Shakti, no pilgrimage and no rituals. No mother, father or guru there. Is it two or one? Kabir says, if you understand now, you're guru, I am disciple.⁴⁸

This is the state in which Kabir can see the ultimate reality as one. Indeed, Kabir's *Ram* tends to be the name of this ultimate reality.

It's a heavy confusion. Veda, Koran, holiness, hell, woman, man, a clay pot shot with air and sperm.... When the pot falls apart, what do you call it? Numskull! You have missed the point. It's all one skin and bone, one piss and shit, one blood, one meat. From one drop, a universe. Who's Brahmin? Who's Shudra? Brahma *rajas*, Shiva *tamas*, Vishnu *sattva*... Kabir says, plunge into Ram. There: No Hindu. No Turk.⁴⁹

In this hymn the Hindu and the Turk are the same, the Brahman and the Shudra are the same, because they spring from the same impersonal reality. They are pots of the same clay.

There are some other important differences between Guru Nanak and Kabir. Guru Nanak rejects both asceticism and renunciation.

Meditation on the True One brings illumination and so one lives detached in the midst of evil. Such is the greatness of the True *Guru* that even surrounded by wife and sons one can attain salvation.⁵⁰

Indeed, only he who earns with his own effort and spares something for others can recognize the path of liberation.⁵¹ Kabir does not contest renunciation or even begging. If one can sing the praises of God in the company of *sants*, begging for food is preferable to a tall mansion full of gold and beautiful women, and a flag flying on its top.⁵² Begging is better than staking a claim to territory and political power.⁵³ A householder should either practise *dharma* as a householder or adopt *bairag*; if a *bairagi* adopts the life of a householder, it is a misfortune.⁵⁴ Kabir's tolerance of mendicancy and renunciation go together: the renunciant has to depend on others for subsistence. This is something that is ridiculed by Guru Nanak in his contest with the *jogis*.

Guru Nanak has no objection to meat-eating but Kabir is strongly in favour of *ahimsa*. It is interesting to note that Kabir rejects the idea of incarnation at one place on the argument that God is too kind to go around killing goblins as a turtle or a fish. Parashuram never slew any princes, *maya* pulled that trick. With cowherds and milkmaids, God did not come to Gokul to kill Kansa. God is gracious, everyone's lord; he does not conquer, does not defeat.⁵⁵ One reason for Kabir's condemnation of the Brahman is that he is a slicked-down butcher; he slaughters a goat and rushes for a buffalo; with a sandalpaste on his brow he does a song and dance for the goddess and crushes souls in the wink of an eye – the river of blood flows on.⁵⁶ The *qazi* is no different: he slaughters cows.⁵⁷ He turns a living soul into a corpse and calls it a holy rite.⁵⁸ Kabir tells the *qazi*:

What kind of work is that, going from house to house chopping heads? Who gave the order for chickens and goats? Who told you to swing the knife? ... Fast all day, kill cows at night, here prayers, there blood; does this please God?⁵⁹

Kabir tells the *pandit* to be kind to created beings and take care of them; without living beings, a living being cannot live; life is the basis of life.⁶⁰ There is no doubt that Kabir regards *ahimsa* as a mark of religious piety. To kill is to commit a grave sin:

Don't murder a poor creature, we all share one breath. Though you hear a thousand Puranas, you won't get free of that death.

This is followed by:

Don't murder a poor creature, he'll pay you back the same. Make pilgrimage, give a million jewels to the gods, but you won't be saved.⁶¹

VI

Like Guru Nanak, Kabir addresses himself to Hindus and Muslims, sometimes together. He associates the Turk with *tariqat* or the path of the Sufis, and he associates the Hindu with Veda and the Puranas.⁶² What may be regarded as Hindu and Muslim orthodoxies are both denounced by Kabir. He asserts that no one can attain liberation without the Name of God.⁶³ He has nothing to learn from the *pandit* and the *mulla*.⁶⁴ On the other hand, the *pandit* and the *mulla* can follow Kabir by appropriating the Name of Ram to the exclusion of everything else.⁶⁵ The Vedas and the *Quran* stand bracketed and rejected as irrelevant for Kabir's purposes. Kabir's *Ram-nam* stands opposed to the known scriptures; the Brahman and the *pandit*, the *mulla* and the *shaikh*, represent the opposite of what Kabir stands for. He ridicules their mutual antagonism as born of ignorance. The *jogi* figures no better than the *pandit*, or the *mulla*, or the *shaikh*. The terminology of the *jogis* is used by Kabir to convey his own message to them. Otherwise their practices are ridiculed and their claim to be on the right path is treated as self-conceit. They too are in need of the Name of Ram.⁶⁶

Kabir denounces the Shaktas, particularly the left-handers who indulge in meat, liquor and sexual intercourse as a religious ritual.⁶⁷ He prefers the Vaishnava over the Shakta.⁶⁸ But the Vaishnava in his own right is not appreciated: his outward appearance conceals inner falsehood, like the gold ornament filled with *lakh*.⁶⁹ Kabir does not approve of any existing system of religious belief and practice. He denounces caste distinctions. However, towards women his attitude is ambivalent: he rejects the idea of impurity associated with the woman who has given birth to a child but he does not contest the idea of woman's subordination. Outside the home, however, she can possibly become a *bairagan*, the counterpart of the male renunciant. On the whole, Kabir's compositions contain a set of ideas which

appear to suggest a system outside the system called Hindu and Muslim.

A scholar who has made a detailed study of the *Bijak* makes the following observation:

Some modern commentators have tried to present Kabir as a synthesizer of Hinduism and Islam; but the picture is a false one. While drawing on various traditions as he saw fit, Kabir emphatically declared his independence from both the major religions of his countrymen, vigorously attacked the follies of both, and tried to kindle the fire of a similar autonomy and courage in those who claimed to be his disciples.⁷⁰

This observation is acceptable so far as Kabir's autonomy or independence is concerned. It also brackets Kabir with Guru Nanak. Their works present systems of inter-related ideas which are independent of all other systems of religious ideas. Their positions are similar not because they belong to the same tradition but because each had a new path to show to his contemporaries. The paths were new but not the same precisely because they were differently conceived from the very beginning.

VII

Guru Nanak tried to give practical shape to his ideals, particularly when his fame had spread and disciples gathered at Kartarpur to learn from him as the acknowledged master, or Guru. Meditation upon the divine Name in the early hours and corporate singing of divine praises (*kirtan*), both in the morning and the evening, formed an essential feature of the devotional life of the disciples (who came to be known as Sikhs in the lifetime of Guru Nanak).⁷¹ The Guru gave instruction to individuals and to regular gatherings of disciples in accordance with the ideas embodied in his compositions. His conception of disciplined worldliness enjoined continuation of normal family relationships. The practice of community meal was introduced at Kartarpur. In other words, the prototype of Gurdwara was established by Guru Nanak with its two essential features: congregational worship in which the *bani* of Guru Nanak was used, and community meal which was maintained with the voluntary contributions from the Sikhs. Before his death, Guru Nanak installed one of his disciples in his place as the Guru in preference to his sons.

A new ideology, the new institutions of guruship and the Gurdwara, and a new socioreligious fraternity can all be clearly traced to Guru Nanak. The Sikh Panth was to develop on the strong basis provided by him. When we turn to Kabir, there is no clear indication that he assumed the formal position of a *guru*, or that he established any formal mode of worship, or that he appointed a successor. It now seems probable that Kabir Panth did not come into existence for more than a century after his death. This would also explain why the Kabir 'tradition' in the *Guru Granth Sahib* is regarded by scholars as not only older but also more authentic than the *Bijak* which began to be compiled in the seventeenth century. In any case, the trajectory of the Kabir Panth bears no resemblance to that of the Sikh Panth. The differences can be explained essentially in terms of what Kabir and Guru Nanak said and did in their lifetime.

VIII

Can we understand the advent of Sikhism in terms of Guru Nanak's response to religious strife? If we listen to Bhai Gurdas, the answer is 'yes'. If we turn to Guru Nanak, however, the answer is much more qualified. In the first place, Guru Nanak uses the terms Hindu and Muslim rather rarely in his compositions, and nowhere talks of Hindu-Muslim confrontation. Nevertheless, he is acutely aware of the religiopolitical domination of Islam. He denounces the policy of discrimination followed by Muslim rulers on the basis of differences in the religious affiliation of their subjects. He also denounces the corruption of the *qazis* who administer justice and association of the Shaikhs with Muslim rule and their dependence on its patronage. Relatively speaking, Guru Nanak appreciates some of the ideas and attitudes of Sufis in comparison with the *ulama*, but both the Sufis and the *ulama* are advised to acquaint themselves with the true path discovered by him.

When it comes to oppression, the Muslim rulers and the Muslim ruling class do not stand alone; they have their collaborators among the non-Muslims, especially Khatri and Brahmans. In addition to their role as the instruments of oppression, they are castigated for the gulf between what they uphold in theory and

what they actually practise. The *varna* ideal is of special importance in this context – it has lost justification in the eyes of Guru Nanak. His denunciation of caste distinctions springs from the moral ideal that all human beings deserve one and the same kind of treatment. As against the rich, the powerful and the privileged, he identifies himself with the poor, the helpless and the unprivileged. In the religious sphere he approves of neither the Brahman and his scriptures, nor the *jogis* and their practices, nor the beliefs and practices of Vaishnava *bhakti*.

Thus, Guru Nanak is critical of all major systems of religious belief and practice in his time. If we look closely at the basis of his criticism, we find that he has his own system of ideas which provides the criteria for criticism. In other words, his own ideology and his criticism of other systems are the obverse and the reverse of the same ethicospiritual coin. Guru Nanak claims that his message comes from God. Those who believe in him take his message to be literally revealed. Even metaphorically, Guru Nanak makes it absolutely clear that he invokes for his ideology no earthly scripture or spiritual or religious authority. He is on his own. Essentially, the ideology of Guru Nanak embodies his creative response not to religious strife but to the total political, social and religious situation of his days. His message was meant to transcend all contemporary dispensations. He is silent about Kabir but it is not difficult to imagine that, despite much appreciation, he would not have entirely approved of his system. Guru Nanak founded a new religion as the basis of a new social order.

NOTES

1. Giani Hazara Singh (ed.), *Varan Bhai Gurdas*, Amritsar: Khalsa Samachar, 1962, *Var I: pauri* 21.
2. Ibid., *Var I, pauri* 27.
3. Ibid., I: 23.
4. Ibid., I: 1.
5. Sahib Singh (ed.), *Asa di Var Steek*, Amritsar: Singh Brothers, 1991 (17th edn.), p. 91.
6. *Guru Granth Sahib*, p. 1191.
7. J.S. Grewal, *Guru Nanak in History*, Chandigarh: Panjab University, 1969, pp. 160-1.

8. *Asa di Var Steek*, pp. 112-13.
9. Cf. J.S. Grewal, *Guru Nanak in History*, p. 163.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 156-7.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 230.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 157.
13. *Asa di Var Steek*, pp. 105-6.
14. *Ibid.*, p. 107.
15. *Guru Nanak in History*, p. 181 n. 72.
16. *Ibid.*, p. 229.
17. *Ibid.*, pp. 230-1.
18. *Ibid.*, p. 231.
19. *Ibid.*, p. 232.
20. *Ibid.*, p. 210.
21. *Ibid.*, p. 211.
22. *Ibid.*, p. 212.
23. *Ibid.*, p. 213.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 215, 216.
25. *Ibid.*, p. 217.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 218.
27. *Ibid.*, p. 218.
28. *Asa di Var Steek*, p. 79.
29. *Ibid.*, p. 45.
30. *Guru Nanak in History*, p. 240.
31. McLeod, *Guru Nanak and the Sikh Religion*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969, pp. 152-8, 161.
32. *Idem*, *Sikhism*, Penguin Books, 1997, p. 88.
33. *Ibid.*, pp. 91-2.
34. *Ibid.*, p. 94.
35. *Ibid.*, p. 101.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 102.
37. McLeod, *Guru Nanak and the Sikh Religion*, p. 200.
38. *Ibid.*, p. 200.
39. *Ibid.*, p. 203.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 191.
41. *Ibid.*, p. 190.
42. *Guru Nanak in History*, p. 237.
43. McLeod, *Guru Nanak and the Sikh Religion*, p. 196.
44. Sahib Singh (ed.), *Steek Bhagat Bani (Kabir)*, Amritsar: Singh Brothers, 1994 (6th edn.), pp. 91, 144, 146, 151, 156, 209, 223, 235.
45. Daljeet Singh, *Essentials of Sikhism*, Amritsar: Singh Brothers, 1994, p. 60.
46. McLeod, *Guru Nanak and the Sikh Religion*, p. 161.
47. *Ibid.*, pp. 176-7.

48. Linda Hess and Shukdev Singh (trs.), *The Bijak of Kabir*, San Francisco: North Point Press, 1983, p. 56.
49. Ibid., p. 67.
50. Bhai Jodh Singh (ed.), *Kabir Bani Steek*, Patiala: Punjabi University, p. 212.
51. Ibid., p. 211.
52. Ibid., p. 239.
53. Ibid., p. 242.
54. Ibid., p. 256.
55. Hess and Singh, *The Bijak*, p. 45.
56. Ibid., p. 46.
57. Ibid., p. 57.
58. Ibid., p. 69.
59. Ibid., pp. 87-8.
60. Ibid., p. 111.
61. Ibid., p. 115.
62. Bhai Jodh Singh, *Kabir Bani Steek*, p. 65.
63. Ibid., p. 22.
64. Ibid., p. 186.
65. Ibid., pp. 184, 219-20.
66. Ibid., pp. 3, 6, 30, 44-5, 47, 122, 124, 14, 163, 167-8, 183, 189, 211.
67. Ibid., p. 89.
68. Ibid., p. 222.
69. Ibid., p. 238.
70. Hess and Singh, *The Bijak*, p. 5.
71. In the *Japji*, for example, the word 'Sikh' is used for both the instruction of the Guru and the person who has received this instruction. The facile suggestion that the word 'Sikh' (*sishya*) means a student or a learner ignores this fact. A Sikh, obviously, is a person who has imbibed Guru Nanak's instruction as his disciple.